

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 39, 42-44, and 46-48 remain pending in the present application. Applicant amends independent Claims 1, 39, and 46 to clarify claimed subject matter and/or correct informalities. The specification and drawings support these claim amendments at least at pages 3-6, 9-12, and at least in Figures 3-5. Therefore, these revisions introduce no new matter.

Claims 1-12, 39, 42-44, and 46-48 are for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicant amends the specification due to the informalities that there was no element 300. Applicant amends the specification to recite element “302” as shown in Figure 4. Therefore, these revisions introduce no new matter. Applicant requests that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

§ 101 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 39, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant amends the claims to recite along the lines of “the processor coupled to processing components” to recite statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims now comply with §101, and respectfully requests that the §101 rejections be withdrawn.

§ 112 SECOND PARAGRAPH REJECTIONS

A. Claims 1, 39, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as lacking antecedent basis. Applicant submits that Claims 1, 39, and 46 already recite “an event log”, prior to the use of “the event log”.

B. Claims 1, 39, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicant amends Claims 1, 39, and 46 to recite “at least one event filter class that represents event filtering parameters; and at least one binding class that represents an association of at least one event consumer and at least one event filter”. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims now comply with §112, second paragraph and respectfully requests that the §112 rejections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 39, 43, 44, and 46-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated under U.S. Patent No. 6,571,285 to Groath et al. (hereinafter “Groath”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and only to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant amends **independent Claim 1**, to clarify further features of the subject matter. Amended Claim 1 now recites an event management system comprising:

a processor;
memory coupled to the processor;
the processor coupled to processing components, wherein the processing components comprises:

a set of event consumers, each event consumer being configured to perform an action in response to an occurrence of an event, the set of event consumers including:

- an email consumer configured to handle email messages;
- a paging consumer configured to generate a page message;
- an active scripting consumer configured to execute at least one script;
- a log file consumer configured to record information in a log file;
- an event log consumer configured to log messages to an event log, wherein the event log provides at least one of selecting, filtering, correlating, forwarding, storing, or delivering event data in an enterprise; and
- a command line consumer configured to launch at least one process; wherein individual event consumers are configured to accept and to use event data from an event source without requiring knowledge about a source of the event;

wherein individual event consumers are configured to perform the action without requiring knowledge about a source of the event;

- at least one event filter class that represents event filtering parameters; and
- at least one binding class that represents an association of at least one event consumer and at least one event filter;

wherein the event management system is implemented with a windows management instrumentation;

wherein the event management system includes a set of policies which are accessible by a windows management instrumentation module.

Applicant respectfully submits that no such system is disclosed by Groath.

Reference Fails to Disclose Features of Claim 1

Groath is directed towards providing service assurance for a network to maintain an agreed upon Quality of Service (col. 2, lines 7-8). Alerts are forwarded to specific individuals based on the contents of the alert (col. 10, lines 40-41) and notification action may be transmitted in operation to notify a recipient about the occurrence of the event in Groath (col. 10, lines 61-63, Fig. 3, Fig. 5, Fig. 10). Hence, the individuals in Groath receive alerts and the recipients receive notification action.

The evidence cited by the Office illustrates how Groath transmits notification action to notify a recipient about the occurrence of the event (304). In contrast, Applicant's amended Claim 1 recites "*individual event consumers accept and use event data from an event source without requiring knowledge about a source of the event, wherein the event management system is implemented with a windows management instrumentation; wherein the event management system includes a set of policies which are accessible by a windows management instrumentation module*". Nowhere is there any discussion or mention of "without requiring knowledge about a source, windows management instrumentation and policies accessible by a windows management instrumentation module" in Groath.

Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Groath and requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 39 and 46 are directed towards systems, and each is allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to Claim 1.

Dependent Claims 2, 4-12, 43-44, and 47-48 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1, 39, and 46, respectively, and thus are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claims 1, 39, and 46, are not disclosed by Groath.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that as each and every feature is not disclosed, the claims are not anticipated by Groath. Applicant respectfully requests that the §102 rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. **Claim 3** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Groath in view of a document entitled “Windows NT Event Logging” by Murray (hereinafter, “Murray”).

B. **Claim 42** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over Groath in view of an article entitled “Network PC System Design Guidelines” (hereinafter, “Network article”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Groath, Murray, and Network Fail to Disclose, Teach, or Suggest Features of Claims

First, as explained above with respect to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicant submits that Groath fails to disclose the features of independent Claims 1 and 39.

Dependent Claims 3 and 42 depend directly or indirectly from one of independent Claims 1 and 39, respectively, and are allowable by virtue of this dependency. These dependent claims are also allowable for their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claims 1 and 39, are not taught, or suggested by Groath, Murray, or Network article.

Second, Applicant asserts Murray and Network article fail to compensate for the deficiencies of Groath. Murray and Network article do not provide what is missing from Groath to support a §103 rejection.

Applicant submits that Groath, Murray, and Network article, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest “*individual event consumers accept and use event data from an event source without requiring knowledge about a source of the event,*

wherein the event management system is implemented with a windows management instrumentation; wherein the event management system includes a set of policies which are accessible by a windows management instrumentation module"¹, as recited in Applicant's amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the evidence relied upon by the Office no longer supports the rejections made under §103(a).

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not render the claimed subject matter obvious and that the claimed subject matter, therefore, patentably distinguishes over the cited references. For all of these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Claims 1-12, 39, 42-44, and 46-48 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the subject application. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: 2-19-2008

By: Shirley Lee Anderson
Shirley Lee Anderson
Reg. No. 57,763
(509) 324-9256 ext. 258